



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

69

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,163	01/14/2002	Keiichi Sugiyama	F9597.0001/P001	5041
32172	7590	05/17/2005	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS (6TH AVENUE) 41 ST FL. NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714			CHEN, TSE W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2116	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	10/043,163	Applicant(s) SUGIYAMA, KEIICHI
Examiner Tse Chen	Art Unit 2116	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 29 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_



**REHANA PERVEEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed April 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant alleges that "there is sufficient disclosure of a detecting routine that automatically detects whether an external storage device is connected to the interface" and supports the allegation with assertions accompanied by referenced citations [pg.3, ll.13-20, I.25 – pg.4, I.5 of specification] on pg.6 of Remarks. Specifically, Applicant points out that since "the detecting routine is done under program control... it is done automatically without any action by the user". Firstly, Examiner reminds Applicant that a detecting routine performed under program control does not inherently [or automatically] mean that it is done automatically without a user. One with very ordinary skill in the art should know that program control directs the flow of routine with the program control at times dependent on user input for guidance. Secondly, Applicant failed to specifically cite where in the disclosure that the detecting routine is actually "done without any action by the user". Without a clear and explicit citation for support, Examiner submits that Applicant's specific assertion is a mere conclusion. Thirdly, Applicant failed to specifically cite where in the disclosure that automatic detection is explicitly taught. One with ordinary skill in the art is left without a clue as to how to perform an automatic detection [e.g., via sequential search, specific signaling, etc.]. Consequently, Examiner submits that it would require undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention.

Applicant alleges that "Gallagher does not automatically detect whether an external storage device is connected to the interface but merely searches valid locations which may contain an operating system". Examiner appreciates Applicant's concession that Gallagher does teach a program that is "executed to sequentially search a plurality of possible sources of the operating system software... possible sources are floppy drive, local hard drive..." By Applicant's concession, Examiner reminds Applicant that as a result of the program's sequential search through a plurality of possible sources of the operating system software, an automatic detection of external storage device is effectively performed [akin to automatically detecting a communication link by sequentially polling various ports or automatically detecting enemy intruders by sequentially scanning various regions in a radar system]. In contrast to Applicant's non-disclosure of the subject matter, Gallagher actually discloses the specific automatic detection routine as related to a sequential search. As such, the rejections are respectfully maintained.